## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

No. C 12-00634 WHA

v.

RICARDO GUTIERREZ,

Defendant.

ORDER RE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE

In defendant's Section 2255 motion, he claims that his court-appointed counsel, Phillip Vaughns, provided him with ineffective assistance of counsel when he allegedly advised defendant to pursue a bench trial based on the necessity defense, rather than accept the government's plea deal. The government contacted Vaughns for a sworn declaration, but he refused to provide one absent a finding by the Court that defendant waived his attorney-client privilege by filing his Section 2255 motion (Dkt. No. 65).

Our court of appeals has held that when a defendant alleges ineffective assistance of counsel and calls his attorney's advice and counsel into question, he has necessarily waived the attorney-client privilege and a "court must impose a waiver [of the privilege] no broader than needed to ensure the fairness of the proceedings before it . . . [but] the holder of the privilege may preserve the confidentiality of the privileged communications by choosing to abandon the claim that gives rise to the waiver condition." *Bittaker v. Woodford*, 331 F.3d 715, 716, 720 (9th Cir. 2003); *United States v. Wang*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2886, at \*1–2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 7, 2013) (Judge Maxine Chesney).

Thus, defendant may have until JANUARY 29, 2014, AT NOON to file a notice that he
wishes to preserve his attorney-client privilege by abandoning his ineffective assistance of
counsel claim. If he does not so file, his attorney-client privilege will be deemed waived as to all
matters raised in his Section 2255 motion. If petitioner decides not to abandon his claim, the
government may have until MARCH 6, 2014, AT NOON to file an opposition to defendant's
Section 2255 motion, including a declaration by former counsel.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 13, 2014.

